



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,291	10/28/2003	Hua Tang	TPIP021	3947
23122	7590	02/04/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			HUYNH, CARLIC K	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/695,291

**Applicant(s)**

TANG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Carlic K. Huynh

**Art Unit**

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :05 November 2007 and 15 January 2008.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt of applicants' amendments and remarks filed on November 23, 2007 is acknowledged.

#### ***Status of the Claims***

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application, with claim 9 having been withdrawn from consideration in response to a Non-Final rejection submitted on October 9, 2007. It is noted claim 9 has been withdrawn from consideration in response to the election/restriction filed on December 19, 2006. Claim 17 has been cancelled in applicants' amendments and remarks filed on July 16, 2007. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-16 are being examined on the merits herein.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicants' arguments, see "Remarks" filed on November 23, 2007, with respect to "Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)" to claims 1-8 have been fully considered and are found persuasive. Applicants have argued that the Zhang et al. (US 2004/0265388) reference has December 30, 2002 as its earliest priority date while the instant application has October 29, 2002 as its earliest priority date. Accordingly, Zhang et al. does not qualify as prior art. Thus the "Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)" to claims 1-8 have been withdrawn in light of the arguments.

3. Applicants' arguments, see "Remarks" filed on November 23, 2007, with respect to "Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103" to claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been fully considered and are found persuasive. Applicants have argued that the Zhang et al. (US 2004/0265388) reference has

Art Unit: 1612

December 30, 2002 as its earliest priority date while the instant application has October 29, 2002 as its earliest priority date. Accordingly, Zhang et al. does not qualify as prior art. Thus the “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103” to claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been withdrawn in light of the arguments.

4. Applicants’ arguments, see “Remarks” filed on November 23, 2007, with respect to “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103” to claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been fully considered and are not found persuasive. Applicants have argued that Bulet et al. teaches “a few proteins that have antimicrobial properties include cysteine among their linked amino acid constituents. In no way does Bulet teach that cysteine, by itself, has antimicrobial properties”.

This argument is not found persuasive because Bulet et al. do teach insect defensins, which are antibacterial proteins that are cysteine-rich (abstract and pages 330 and 333). Because cysteine is a major component of insect defensins, cysteine, in this case, may be seen as an antibacterial agent.

Examiner notes that Mirejovsky et al. (US 6,147,122) and Mishra et al. (US 7,097,849) are, indeed, “silent with respect to cysteine or components structurally similar to cysteine”. Examiner also notes that Bulet et al., indeed, do not teach “the use of cysteine as a preservative” but nonetheless contains cysteine (abstract and pages 330 and 333). Since instant claims 1-8 and 10-16 are directed to pharmaceutical compositions, intended use is not given any patentable weight.

Thus the “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103” to claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been maintained.

Art Unit: 1612

5. Applicants' arguments, see "Remarks" filed on November 23, 2007, with respect to "Double Patenting Rejections" to claim 1 have been acknowledged. Applicants have stated they "will address these rejections, if needed, when the claims of this application have been deemed allowable". Thus the "Obviousness-Type Double Patenting" rejections to claim 1 have been maintained.

6. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The following new ground(s) of rejection to amended claims 1-8 and 10-16 are used herewith.

Claims 1-8 and 10-16 are directed to a pharmaceutical composition and thus intended use is not given any patentable weight.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Information Disclosure Statements submitted on November 5, 2007 and January 15, 2008, are acknowledged.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1612

7. Claims 1-8 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirejovsky et al. (US 6,147,122) in view of Mishra et al. (US 7,097,849), as evidenced by Bulet et al. (Developmental and Comparative Immunology, 1999, vol. 23, pp 329-344).

Mirejovsky et al. teach a propofol composition containing sulfite as an anti-microbial agent (abstract).

The propofol composition of Mirejovsky et al. is prepared by injection (column 12, line 43). Propofol is 1% by weight of the composition and is soluble in the aqueous phase (column 4, line 35; and column 3, line 27). The propofol composition also contains a water-immiscible solvent, such as vegetable oil, at 10% weight, a surfactant, such as egg or soy phosphatides, at 1.2% weight, and is formulated with pH in the range of about 4.5 to about 6.4 (column 4, lines 32-35, 48-50, 59, and 63-65; column 5, lines 19-20; and column 12, line 47).

The anti-microbial agent of the propofol composition is about 0.0075% to about 0.66% weight (column 4, lines 12-14). The anti-microbial agent is in an amount sufficient to prevent the growth, or prevent no more than a 10-fold increase in growth, of each of *S. aureus* (ATCC 6583), *E. coli* (ATCC 8739), *P. aeruginosa* (ATCC 9027), and *C. albicans* (ATCC 10231) for at least 24 hours wherein each organism is added at 50-200 colony forming units and incubated at 30-35°C (column 8, 3. Microbiological activity; and column 12, lines 25-38).

Mirejovsky et al. do not teach cysteine as the anti-microbial agent and a local anesthetic.

Mishra et al. teach a propofol composition comprising an anti-microbial agent and a local or long lasting anesthetic, such as lidocaine (column 1, line 7; and column 5, lines 47-51).

As evidenced by Bulet et al., it is disclosed that insect defensins, which are cysteine-rich peptides, are an antimicrobial peptide or agent (abstract and pages 330 and 333).

Art Unit: 1612

Since cysteine is known to be an antibacterial agent, it would be obvious that the anti-microbial agent of Mishra et al. may be cysteine.

To a person of skill in the art at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to employ the propofol composition of Mirejovsky et al. to contain an anti-microbial agent and a local anesthetic because the propofol compositions of Mishra et al. contain an anti-microbial agent and a local anesthetic and according to Mishra et al., propofol compositions can contain an antibacterial agent such as cysteine and an additional local or long acting anesthetic such as lidocaine.

The motivation to combine the propofol composition of Mirejovsky et al. to the propofol composition of Mishra et al. is that the propofol compositions of Mishra et al., contain an antibacterial agent such as cysteine and an additional local or long acting anesthetic such as lidocaine.

### ***Double Patenting***

#### **Obviousness-Type**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned



Art Unit: 1612

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Zhang et al. (US 2005/0027019) will be referred to as (10/629,308), Zhang et al. (US 2004/0220283) will be referred to as (10/677,747), and Zhang et al. (US 2004/0265388) will be referred to as (10/766,631).

8. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 6 of copending Application Zhang et al. (10/629,308) as evidenced by Bulet et al. (Developmental and Comparative Immunology, 1999, vol. 23, pp 329-344).

Claims 1, 2, and 6 of copending Application Zhang et al. are directed to an aqueous composition comprising propofol and an antimicrobial agent.

As evidenced by Bulet et al., it is disclosed that insect defensins, which are cysteine-rich peptides, are an antimicrobial peptide or agent (abstract and pages 330 and 333).

Since cysteine is an antibacterial agent, it would be obvious that cysteine is an antimicrobial agent. Thus, claims 1, 2, and 6 of copending Application Zhang et al. meets the limitations of the instant claim 1.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not been patented.

9. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18 and 23 of copending Application Zhang et al.

Art Unit: 1612

(10/677,747) as evidenced by Bulet et al. (Developmental and Comparative Immunology, 1999, vol. 23, pp 329-344).

Claims 18 and 23 of copending Application Zhang et al. (US 2004/0220283) are directed to a composition comprising propofol and an antimicrobial agent.

As evidenced by Bulet et al., it is disclosed that insect defensins, which are cysteine-rich peptides, are an antimicrobial peptide or agent (abstract and pages 330 and 333).

Since cysteine is an antibacterial agent, it would be obvious that cysteine is an antimicrobial agent. Thus, claims 18 and 23 of copending Application Zhang et al. meets the limitations of the instant claim 1.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not been patented.

10. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 35-36 of copending Application Zhang et al. (10/766,631).

Claims 1 and 35-36 of copending Application Zhang et al. are directed to a composition consisting essentially of an aqueous solution of propofol and cysteine. "Consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355. Thus, claims 1 and 35-36 of copending Application Zhang et al. meets the limitations of the instant claim 1.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not been patented.

*Conclusion*

11. No claims are allowed.
12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlic K. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-5574. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ckh



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER